



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/591,687	06/12/2000	Robert Rosko	47004.000074	4829

21967 7590 12/30/2005

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
1900 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 1200  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 12/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/591,687	ROSKO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Khanh Dinh	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Remarks filed on 10/5/2005. Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-15, 17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Freun US pat. No.5,987,611 (hereafter Freund) in view of He et al., US pat. No.6,088,451.

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 1, Freund discloses a method for accessing one of a plurality of remote service providers (web server 350's of fig.3B can be Internet Service providers) across a network via a single login to a host service provider (320a fig.3B), each of the plurality of remote service providers being accessible through the host service provider, and each of the plurality service providers having separate login procedures requiring data comprising the steps of:

the host service provider (320a fig.3B) receiving the single login (providing remote login from clients 310's fig.3A), the host service provider (see abstract, fig.3B, col.21 line 47 to col.22 line 21).

a universal session manager (373 fig.3B) retrieving data from a validation database (374 fig.3B) based on the single login, wherein the data is effective for accessing a remote service provider and is based at least in part on the received username and password (i.e., monitoring user access, col.22 line 23 to col.23 line 55).

Freund does not disclose transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider after the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication and the host service provider directing the user to the remote service provider. However, He discloses transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider after the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication and the host service provider (credential server 204 fig.2) for directing the user to the remote service provider (using credential server 204 to manage user credentials with authentication server 202, see fig.2, abstract, see col.11 line 54 to

Art Unit: 2151

col.12 line 33 and col.12 line 65 to col.13 line 63). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement He's teachings into the computer system of Freund to control network access because it would have relieved the administrative burden to effectively and efficiently control and manage user credentials and thus enabled the enhanced the effectiveness of the access control mechanisms.

As to claims 2 and 10, Freund discloses a trusted service module (372 fig.3B) acts as an intermediary between the host service provider and the trusted service provider (i.e., a secure session transaction with the servers 350's fig.3B, see col.22 lines 1-59).

As to claim 3, Freund discloses receiving the session ID from the trusted service provider (see figs.7A-B, col.24 lines 16-63 and col.25 lines 14-51).

As to claims 4, 6 and 9, Freund discloses placing a text file on the user's network data acquisition module and registering the user with the remote service provider (establishing user-define group, see col.25 line 14 to col.26 line 50).

As to claim 7, Freund further discloses a method for accessing one of a plurality of remote service providers across a network via a single login to a host service provider (320a fig.3B) each of the plurality of remote service providers (350's fig.3B) being

accessible through the host service provider, and each of the plurality service providers having separate login procedures requiring data comprising:

a user system having a network data acquisition module and plurality of remote service providers (350's fig.3B) (see abstract, fig.3B, col.21 line 47 to col.22 line 21).

a universal session manager (373 fig.3B) for receiving a user's ID and password (identification code and password, see col.13 lines 1-31) and passing data required for access to said remote service provider and a validation database (374 fig.3B) for storing information for accessing the remote service provider (using authentication server 371 fig.3B for checking client/user ID and password, see col.22 lines 1-59).

Freund does not disclose transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider after the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication and the host service provider directing the user to the selected one of remote service providers. However, He discloses transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider after the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication and the host service provider (credential server 204 fig.2) for directing the user to the selected one of remote service providers (using credential server 204 to manage user credentials with authentication server 202, see fig.2, abstract, see col.11 line 54 to col.12 line 33 and col.12 line 65 to col.13 line 63). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement He's teachings into the computer system of Freund to control network access because it would have relieved the administrative burden to effectively

Art Unit: 2151

and efficiently control and manage user credentials and thus enabled the enhanced the effectiveness of the access control mechanisms.

As to claims 11, 13-15, Freund discloses a remote service provider with access requirements, registration module for receiving data to the services, a login module for gaining access the data for registering a user with the remote service provider (establishing and providing secure users' transactions, see col.22 lines 7-59 and col.24 lines 16-63).

As to claim 12, Freund discloses an Internet Browser (client application software includes a Web browser, see fig.2, col.7 line 64 to col.8 line 10).

As to claim 17, Freund discloses the remote service provider is a distinct remote site from the host service provider (see fig.3B, col.21 line 57 to col.22 line 34).

As to claims 19-21, Freund discloses the validation database transmitting data to the universal session manager indicating which service the user is enrolled (using database 374 fig.3B for storing record of users) and the single login from the user is performed over a network (see fig.3B, col.21 line 57 to col.22 line 34 and col.24 lines 16-63).

4. Claims 5, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freund and He and in view of Kirsch US pat. No.5,963,915.

Art Unit: 2151

Freund 's teachings still applied as in item 3 above. Freund does not specifically disclose a triple handshakes and a cookie. However, Kirsch discloses a triple handshakes and a cookie (i.e., providing a cookie and a series of handshake transactions to negotiate the establishment of the secure transactions between the servers, see col.2 lines 1-46 and col.8 lines 12-63). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Kirsch's teachings into the computer system of Freund to process data transaction over the Internet because it would have provided automatic simultaneous purchase transactions handling for both secure and insecure client browsers and increased levels of authentication of data communications in the Internet.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/5/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant asserts that the cited reference does not disclose the interrelationship between the universal session manager, the host service provider and the remote service provider.

*Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner respectfully point out that Freund discloses the claimed invention by showing a method for accessing one of a plurality of remote service providers (web server 350's of fig.3B can be Internet Service providers) across a network via a single login to a host service provider (320a fig.3B), each of the plurality of remote service providers being accessible through the host service provider,*



Art Unit: 2151

*and each of the plurality service providers having separate login procedures requiring data comprising the host service provider (320a fig.3B) receiving the single login [providing remote login from clients (310's fig.3A) and to deny/allow users' access the Internet) the host service provider (see abstract, fig.3B, col.21 line 47 to col.22 line 40). Therefore, Freun discloses the interrelationship between the universal session manager, the host service provider and the remote service provider as Applicant' claimed invention.*

- Applicant asserts that the cited reference does not disclose transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider after the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication and the host service provider.

*Examiner respectfully maintains that He discloses transmitting data to the remote service provider and directing the user to the remote service provider after the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication and the host service provider (credential server 204 fig.2) for directing the user to the selected one of remote service providers (using credential server 204 to manage user credentials with authentication server 202, see fig.2, abstract, see col.11 line 54 to col.12 line 33 and col.12 line 65 to col.13 line 63) as disclosed above.*

- Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references.

*In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have relieved the administrative burden to effectively and efficiently control and manage user credentials and thus enhanced the effectiveness of the access control mechanisms.*

- Applicant asserts that the combination of Freund, He and Kirsch does not disclose the claimed invention

*Examiner respectfully points out that the combination of Freund, He and Kirsch discloses the claimed invention. Taking claims 5, 16 and 18 for example, Freund does not specifically disclose a triple handshakes and a cookie. However, Kirsch discloses a triple handshakes and a cookie (i.e., providing a cookie and a series of handshake transactions to negotiate the establishment of the secure transactions between the servers, see col.2 lines 1-46 and col.8 lines 12-63). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Kirsch's teachings into the computer system of Freund to process data transaction over the Internet because it would have provided automatic simultaneous purchase transactions*

*handling for both secure and insecure client browsers and increased levels of authentication of data communications in the Internet.*

*As a result, cited prior art **does** disclose a method for accessing one of a plurality of remote service providers, as broadly claimed by the Applicants. Applicants clearly have still failed to identify specific claim limitations that would define a clearly patentable distinction over prior art.*

### **Conclusion**

6. Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are *rejected*.
7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2151

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Khanh Dinh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2151  
12/21/2005